Meeting Minutes

Date | Time | 12/7/2016 12:00 AM | *Pacific Standard Time*

Location | The Lands Council (TLC)
Saranac Building
25 West Main Ave, Spokane
2nd Floor Large Conference Room

Project | Fungi PCB Research

Conference Line | Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)

Meeting Reference Documents:

1 - Minutes Fungi PCB 20160921
2 - VW ExpDesign Task 6 12-1-2016
3 - Fungi Sample Jar Pictures
4 - Table of Baseline Results
5 - Baseline Congener graphs 10242016
6 - Baseline Congeners Highest Ave Conc & Stdev 10242016

Attendees in person:

Marcia Davis, City of Spokane
Adrianne Pearson, City of Spokane
Doug Greenlund, City of Spokane
Jeff Donovan, RPWRF
Mike Peterson, The Lands Council
Heidi Montez, The Lands Council
Aimee Navickis-Brasch, HDR

Attendees on conference line:

Michelle Mullin, EPA Region 10
Lisa Rodenburg, Rutgers
Mark Maurer, Thurston County
Maureen Johnson, Certified Safety Professional

Meeting Minutes

The meeting opened with the *attendees introducing themselves*.

The meeting started with Heidi providing the group with an overview of the tasks completed since the last meeting which included referencing handouts 2-3 (see meeting reference documents sent out with the agenda). Highlights from that discussion are as follows:

The sample collection process:

- A consistent 91 day incubation period was used for all jars to allow the fungi to grow
- A total of 20 samples were collected on 11/15, 11/17 and 11/30. This included collecting samples from: 2 jars with the same fungi species (16 samples), a triplicate sample was collected from one jar (2 additional samples), and samples were collected from the control jars (2 samples).
- All samples were collected and mixed using a stainless-steel spoon and bowl, which were washed between samples using a pesticide grade acetone. Latex gloves and safety glasses were worn during collection.

Observation of changes within the jars during the study

- Several species of the fungi had mold. The Oyster species (blue, white, and pink) did not have mold except the local wild oyster which was visually observed at the end of the incubation period.
- In the jars with mold, the mold grew in a line as if the fungi was resisting the mold growth. Heidi's theory for the mold was that the VW had mold spores (because VW was not sterilized) and some fungi are more resistant to mold growth than others.
- Some jars of mycelium did not become as dense as expected particularly the jar that contained Pleurotus djamor. Heidi is not certain why the density varied however possible explanations include competition/ contamination.

Additional analytical testing: Aimee reviewed baseline analytical results and brought up Heidi's request to test for additional parameters. Highlights from that discussion are as follows:

- The group questioned the value of testing the jars for the post concentration of additional parameters since only the vactor waste was tested for the baseline concentrations of these parameters (i.e. metals, NO3/NO2-N, Total Phosphorus, Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons (TPH), Pesticides, etc.).
- The group also noted that testing for TPH would be challenging because the samples were in a glass jar and TPH have a tendency to stick to glass. Jars with a higher ratio of vactor waste may provide helpful information regarding the post TPH concentration. Test America runs the NWTPH testing locally and Jeff will investigate holding times for this testing.
- The group decided to not run any other testing at this time, instead the remaining jars were frozen in the event that the planned analytical testing results indicate more testing would be beneficial to this study.
    - **Action Item**: Jeff will investigate holding times for NWTPH testing.

General PCB Discussion

- Aimee reviewed the tables and graphs (handouts 4-6) with the group that summarized the baseline PCB results. The group requested the following revisions to these documents to improve clarify: remove non-detects, add units to the table, and increase the significant figures of the results.
- Lisa requested a copy of the results to review (both baseline and post). Adrianne asked how much information Lisa would be providing on interpreting the PCB data. Aimee agreed to follow up with Lisa regarding her role involvement in reviewing/interpreting the data.
- Marcia told the group about an EPA video on PCBs. In particular, the presenter good information about testing and removing PCBs. Although the project was not the same as what was done on our project.
- Michelle indicated that if we have any questions about PCB testing – Winston Lu from EPA might be able to answer them. His presentation is available at the following link. From the webinar log-in screen, click on "Go To Seminar" and it will launch the webinar

on PCB Treatment Technologies by Winston Lu, presented in December, 2016. [HYPERLINK "https://clu-in.org/conf/tio/rcraexpert_120716/"]

- **Action Items**: Aimee will revise the baseline graphs. Aimee contacted Lisa about her role/involvement reviewing/interpreting the PCB data. Lisa agreed to run PDB results through her model and provide summary of her results at the next meeting.

Remaining Tasks and Schedule: Heidi provided an overview of the remaining tasks and schedule:

- PCB results are expected back by the end of January/early February
- Results will be in dry weight
- Heidi is planning to release the final report around the end of March or early April
- Heidi also plans to present the report to Public Works in the Spring.

Next Meeting

Next meeting was scheduled for Thursday ~~March 9th~~ March 30th on a Thursday from 1:15 to 3:15pm.